Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 1 of 22 PageID #: 14 12/2/2019



Search for Cases by: Select Search Method..

Judicial Links

Case Header

1 eFiling Help

Contact Us | Print

GrantedPublicAccess Logoff RCHRISTENSEN

C00996 - OTIS L ENCKISER (E-CASE Scheduled Gamishments/ Filings Due Civil Charges, Judgments Parties & Docket Entries Service Information Hearings & Trials Judgments Execution Attorneys & Sentences

This information is provided as a service and is not considered an official court record.

Click here to eFile on Case

Click here to Respond to Selected Documents

Sort Date Entries:

Descending

Ascending

Display Options:

All Entries

11/25/2019 Agent Served

> Document ID - 19-SMCC-1909; Served To - RECKITT BENCKISER LLC; Server - COLE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; Served Date - 05-NOV-19; Served Time - 07:30:00; Service Type - Sheriff Department; Reason Description - Served; Service Text - SERVED S. L., DESIGNEE.

10/24/2019 Request for Records Filed

REQUESTED COPIES WERE MAILED OUT. CJ

10/22/2019 Summons Issued-Circuit

Document ID: 19-SMCC-1909, for RECKITT BENCKISER LLC. SUMMONS SAVED AND ATTACHED IN PDF FORM FOR ATTORNEY TO RETRIEVE FROM SECURE CASE.NET. TMV

10/18/2019 Filing Info Sheet eFiling

Filed By: JOSHUA GRAHAM MILLER

Note to Clerk eFiling

Filed By: JOSHUA GRAHAM MILLER

Confid Filing Info Sheet Filed

Circuit Civil Information Sheet.

Filed By: JOSHUA GRAHAM MILLER

On Behalf Of: OTIS LAWSON

Summ Req-Circuit Pers Serv

Request for Summons.

Filed By: JOSHUA GRAHAM MILLER

Pet Filed in Circuit Ct

Petition; Exhibit 1; Exhibit 2.

Judge Assigned

Case net Version 5.14.0.16

Return to Top of Page

Released 10/24/2019

IN THE 11ST CIRCUIT COURT OF ST. CHARLES COUNTY STATE OF MISSOURI

OTIS LAWSON,)
Plaintiff,)
v. RECKITT BENCKISER, LLC, a foreign limited liability company,) Cause No.:) Division No.:)
SERVE REGISTERED AGENT: CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Co. 221 Bolivar Street))) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Jefferson City, MO 65101)
Defendant.)

PETITION

COMES NOW Plaintiff, OTIS LAWSON ("LAWSON"), by and through undersigned counsel, and for his Petition against Defendant, RECKITT BENCKISER, LLC, a foreign limited liability company ("RB"), hereby states and alleges the following:

STATEMENT OF CASE

1. This is an action brought to remedy, inter alia, Defendant's violations of Plaintiff's civil rights for the unlawful deprivation of Plaintiff's rights and privileges accorded her by the United States Constitution because of the Defendants unlawful retaliatory and discriminatory practices against Plaintiff's civil rights pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (hereinafter "Civil Rights Act"), 42 U.S.C. § 1981, as amended, the Missouri Human Rights Act § 213.010., et seq.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Plaintiff, Lawson, is an individual who resided at all relevant times in the County of St. Louis, State of Missouri.

- 3. Defendant, RB, is a foreign limited liability company purposely and continuously availing itself of the benefits of doing business in Missouri by operating locations in Missouri; specifically including St. Charles County.
- 4. Venue is proper within this Court because the unlawful practices complained of herein occurred in the County of St. Charles, State of Missouri.
- 5. Plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination and was issued a Notice of Right to Sue by the Missouri Commission on Human Rights. (See Exhibit 1).
- 6. Plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination and was issued a Notice of Right to Sue by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (See Exhibit 2).

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. Defendant, RB, employs 200 or more persons within the state for pay.
- 8. Defendant, RB, is an employer as that term is defined under the Missouri Human Rights Act.
 - 9. Defendant, RB is an employer as that term is defined under the Civil Rights Act.
 - 10. LAWSON, is a 46-year-old African American Man.
- 11. LAWSON was hired by RB in June of 2017 as a forklift operator LLC facility located in St. Charles County.
- 12. While working at RB, LAWSON was subjected to a hostile work environment and other discriminatory behavior.
- 13. In the spring of 2018, a noose was placed on a forklift and racially disparaging graffiti was placed found in the men's restroom. Management sent out a memorandum, but no real action was taken and the environment continued to be hostile to minorities.
 - 14. In June 2018, LAWSON suffered a heart attack.

- 15. LAWSON was out of work for approximately three (3) days and was placed on light duty.
- 16. Soon after LAWSON's heart attack, he began to be harassed by Human Resources about his attendance.
- 17. Human Resources claimed LAWSON had exceeded his attendance points when he had not.
- 18. When LAWSON proved RB's Humans Resources department was wrong about his attendance, RB manufacture a new reason to justify LAWSON's termination.
 - 19. LAWSON was subsequently accused of sleeping on the job.
 - 20. LAWSON denied this allegation.
- 21. Even if LAWSON had slept on the job, there was a disparity between how non-white, non-male employees were treated under similar circumstances at RB.
- 22. The white female employee who "observed" LAWSON allegedly sleeping had been actually caught sleeping in the past, but she did not suffer any discipline.
- 23. Despite the double standard, on August 6, 2018, LAWSON was told he was being terminated for sleeping on the job.

COUNT I (Civil Rights Act –Race Discrimination)

- 24. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1-23 of this Complaint as if fully stated herein.
- 25. At all relevant times, Defendant RB was an employer and/or an agent covered by and within the meaning of the Civil Rights Act.
- 26. Plaintiff's race was a motivating factor in Defendant RB's wrongful discriminatory treatment described and set forth above including, but not limited to Plaintiff's termination.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 5 of 22 PageID #: 18

- 27. Defendant RB's actions were intentional with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights and sensibilities.
- 28. Defendant RB and its agents, representatives and employees treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated employees based on unlawful consideration of his race.
- 29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant RB's wrongful acts, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages. These include, but are not limited to, the following: past and future wage loss; past and future lost earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, loss of sleep and interference with her enjoyment of life; and emotional distress, all of which will continue into the future.
- 30. All of the actions of Defendant RB were intentional, careless and/or reckless and performed in complete disregard of the law and the rights of Plaintiff, for which conduct and actions, punitive damages are properly imposed in such amounts as will punish Defendant GPC for its wrongful conduct and deter it and others from like conduct in the future.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant RB and that Plaintiff be awarded past, present and future lost wages and benefits; compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages; interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees and expert witness fees; any other relief afforded Plaintiff under the Civil Rights Act, and all other relief deemed just and equitable.

COUNT II (Missouri Human Rights Act – Race Discrimination)

- 31. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1-23 of this Complaint.
- 32. At all relevant times, Defendant, RB, was an employer and/or an agent covered by and within the meaning of the Illinois Human Rights Act.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 6 of 22 PageID #: 19

- 33. Plaintiff's race was a contributing factor in Defendant's wrongful discriminatory treatment described and set forth above, including but not limited to Plaintiff's termination.
- 34. Alternatively, Plaintiff's race was a motivating factor in Defendant's disparate treatment of Plaintiff.
- 35. Defendant's actions were intentional with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights and sensibilities.
- 36. Defendant RB and its agents, representatives and employees treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated employees based on unlawful consideration of race.
- 37. As a result of Defendant's wrongful acts, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages. These include, but are not limited to, the following: past and future wage loss; past and future lost earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, loss of sleep and interference with her enjoyment of life; and emotional distress, all of which will continue into the future.
- 38. All of the actions of Defendant were intentional, careless and/or reckless and performed in complete disregard of the law and the rights of Plaintiff, for which conduct and actions, punitive damages are properly imposed in such amounts as will punish Defendant RB for its wrongful conduct and deter it and others from like conduct in the future.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant RB that Plaintiff be awarded past, present and future lost wages and benefits; compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages; interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees and expert witness fees; any other relief afforded Plaintiff under The Illinois Human Rights Act, and all other relief deemed just and equitable.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 7 of 22 PageID #: 20

COUNT III (Civil Rights Act –Sex Discrimination)

- 39. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1-23 of this Complaint as if fully stated herein.
- 40. At all relevant times, Defendant RB was an employer and/or an agent covered by and within the meaning of the Civil Rights Act.
- 41. Plaintiff's sex was a motivating factor in Defendant RB's wrongful discriminatory treatment described and set forth above including, but not limited to Plaintiff's termination.
- 42. Defendant RB's actions were intentional with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights and sensibilities.
- 43. Defendant RB and its agents, representatives and employees treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated employees based on unlawful consideration of his sex.
- 44. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant RB's wrongful acts, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages. These include, but are not limited to, the following: past and future wage loss; past and future lost earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, loss of sleep and interference with her enjoyment of life; and emotional distress, all of which will continue into the future.
- 45. All of the actions of Defendant RB were intentional, careless and/or reckless and performed in complete disregard of the law and the rights of Plaintiff, for which conduct and actions, punitive damages are properly imposed in such amounts as will punish Defendant GPC for its wrongful conduct and deter it and others from like conduct in the future.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant RB and that Plaintiff be awarded past, present and future lost wages and benefits; compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages; interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees and expert witness

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 8 of 22 PageID #: 21

fees; any other relief afforded Plaintiff under the Civil Rights Act, and all other relief deemed just and equitable.

COUNT IV (Missouri Human Rights Act – Sex Discrimination)

- 46. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1-23 of this Complaint.
- 47. At all relevant times, Defendant, RB, was an employer and/or an agent covered by and within the meaning of the Illinois Human Rights Act.
- 48. Plaintiff's sex was a contributing factor in Defendant's wrongful discriminatory treatment described and set forth above, including but not limited to Plaintiff's termination.
- 49. Alternatively, Plaintiff's sex was a motivating factor in Defendant's disparate treatment of Plaintiff.
- 50. Defendant's actions were intentional with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights and sensibilities.
- 51. Defendant RB and its agents, representatives and employees treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated employees based on unlawful consideration of sex.
- 52. As a result of Defendant's wrongful acts, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages. These include, but are not limited to, the following: past and future wage loss; past and future lost earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, loss of sleep and interference with her enjoyment of life; and emotional distress, all of which will continue into the future.
- 53. All of the actions of Defendant were intentional, careless and/or reckless and performed in complete disregard of the law and the rights of Plaintiff, for which conduct and actions, punitive damages are properly imposed in such amounts as will punish Defendant RB for its wrongful conduct and deter it and others from like conduct in the future.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 9 of 22 PageID #: 22

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant RB that Plaintiff be awarded past, present and future lost wages and benefits; compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages; interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees and expert witness fees; any other relief afforded Plaintiff under The Illinois Human Rights Act, and all other relief deemed just and equitable.

COUNT V (Civil Rights Act –Disability Discrimination)

- 54. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1-23 of this Complaint as if fully stated herein.
- 55. At all relevant times, Defendant RB was an employer and/or an agent covered by and within the meaning of the Civil Rights Act.
- 56. Plaintiff's disability, or perceived disability, was a motivating factor in Defendant RB's wrongful discriminatory treatment described and set forth above including, but not limited to Plaintiff's termination.
- 57. Defendant RB's actions were intentional with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights and sensibilities.
- 58. Defendant RB and its agents, representatives and employees treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated employees based on unlawful consideration of his disability, or perceived disability.
- 59. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant RB's wrongful acts, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages. These include, but are not limited to, the following: past and future wage loss; past and future lost earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, loss of sleep and interference with her enjoyment of life; and emotional distress, all of which will continue into the future.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 10 of 22 PageID #: 23

60. All of the actions of Defendant RB were intentional, careless and/or reckless and performed in complete disregard of the law and the rights of Plaintiff, for which conduct and actions, punitive damages are properly imposed in such amounts as will punish Defendant GPC for its wrongful conduct and deter it and others from like conduct in the future.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant RB and that Plaintiff be awarded past, present and future lost wages and benefits; compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages; interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees and expert witness fees; any other relief afforded Plaintiff under the Civil Rights Act, and all other relief deemed just and equitable.

COUNT VI (Missouri Human Rights Act – Disability Discrimination)

- 61. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1-23 of this Complaint.
- 62. At all relevant times, Defendant, RB, was an employer and/or an agent covered by and within the meaning of the Illinois Human Rights Act.
- 63. Plaintiff's disability, or perceived disability, was a contributing factor in Defendant's wrongful discriminatory treatment described and set forth above, including but not limited to Plaintiff's termination.
- 64. Alternatively, Plaintiff's disability, or perceived disability, was a motivating factor in Defendant's disparate treatment of Plaintiff.
- 65. Defendant's actions were intentional with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights and sensibilities.
- 66. Defendant RB and its agents, representatives and employees treated Plaintiff differently than similarly situated employees based on unlawful consideration of disability, or perceived disability.

- 67. As a result of Defendant's wrongful acts, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages. These include, but are not limited to, the following: past and future wage loss; past and future lost earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, loss of sleep and interference with her enjoyment of life; and emotional distress, all of which will continue into the future.
- 68. All of the actions of Defendant were intentional, careless and/or reckless and performed in complete disregard of the law and the rights of Plaintiff, for which conduct and actions, punitive damages are properly imposed in such amounts as will punish Defendant RB for its wrongful conduct and deter it and others from like conduct in the future.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant RB that Plaintiff be awarded past, present and future lost wages and benefits; compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages; interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees and expert witness fees; any other relief afforded Plaintiff under The Illinois Human Rights Act, and all other relief deemed just and equitable.

COUNT V (Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981 RB)

- 69. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1-23 of this Complaint.
- 70. RB discriminated against Plaintiff based upon his race in violation of the rights of Plaintiff afforded him by 42 U.S.C. §1981.
- 71. By the conducts described above, RB intentionally deprived Plaintiff, an African American, of the same rights as are enjoyed by white citizens to the creation, performance, enjoyment, and all benefits and privileges, of their contractual employment relationship with RB in violation of 42 U.S.C. §1981.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 12 of 22 PageID #: 25

- 72. As a result of RB's discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. §1981, Plaintiff has been denied employment opportunities providing substantial compensation and benefits, thereby entitling him to injunctive and equitable monetary relief; and have suffered anguish, humiliation, distress, inconvenience and loss of enjoyment of life because of RB's actions, thereby entitling his to compensatory damages.
- 73. Defendant's actions were intentional with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights and sensibilities.
- 74. As a result of Defendant's wrongful acts, Plaintiff has sustained injuries and damages. These include, but are not limited to, the following: past and future wage loss; past and future lost earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anxiety, loss of sleep and interference with her enjoyment of life; and emotional distress, all of which will continue into the future.
- 75. All of the actions of Defendant were intentional, careless and/or reckless and performed in complete disregard of the law and the rights of Plaintiff, for which conduct and actions, punitive damages are properly imposed in such amounts as will punish Defendant RB for its wrongful conduct and deter it and others from like conduct in the future.
- 76. In its discriminatory actions as alleged above, RB has acted with malice or reckless indifference to the rights of the Plaintiff, thereby entitling him to an award of punitive damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court grant relief against each of the Defendant GPC as follows:

(a) Enter a declaratory judgment declaring that the Defendant has willfully and wrongfully violated its constitutional, statutory, and legal obligations, and deprived Plaintiff of his rights, privileges, protections, compensation and entitlements under law, as alleged

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 13 of 22 PageID #: 26

herein;

- (b) Enter a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant from continuing to adopt, apply, and enforce policies, regulations, directives, decisions, procedures, and practices which prevent, prohibit, restrain and restrict Plaintiff from exercising his constitutional rights;
- (c) Order Defendants to rescind the termination of Plaintiff and to immediately reinstate him to his positions with RB.
- (d) Enter a permanent injunction restraining and preventing Defendant from continuing to discriminate and retaliate against Plaintiff, from continuing to interfere with and infringe upon the rights of Plaintiff, and from otherwise violating their obligations under the U.S. Constitution and the law;
- (e) Order a complete and accurate accounting of all the compensation and relief to which Plaintiff is entitled;
- (f) Award Plaintiff monetary damages in the form of back pay, compensation, benefits, unpaid entitlements, plus pre-judgment and post-judgement interest;
- (g) Award the Plaintiff substantial compensatory damages payable by the Defendant, for the violation of Plaintiff's rights and the harm to her reputations, humiliation, emotional and mental anguish, and for other financial and consequential harm and injuries they have suffered;
- (h) Award the Plaintiff's his reasonable attorneys' fees and the costs and disbursements of this action; and
- (i) Grant such other legal and equitable relief as may be just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury on the claims presented in this Complaint.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 14 of 22 PageID #: 27

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant, RECKITT BENCKISER, LLC, and that Plaintiff be awarded past, present and future lost wages and benefits; compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages; interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees; any other relief afforded Plaintiff under the law, and all other relief deemed just and equitable.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO SB43

To any extent that Plaintiff is required to raise any constitutional challenges to SB43 at this time, Plaintiff states as follows:

- 77. On August 28, 2017, SB43 went into effect as a law approved by the Missouri Legislature and signed by the former Missouri Governor Greitens.
- 78. To any extent that SB43 changed, altered, or amended the law in any manner with respect to Plaintiff's claims, SB43 should be deemed unconstitutional.
- 79. Mo. Const. Art. I, § 22(a) states: "that the right of trial by jury as heretofore enjoyed shall remain inviolate." SB43 has, among others, enacted caps on damages, changed the burden of proof, and eliminated causes of action that are common law rights that violates the Missouri Constitution.
- 80. Mo. Const., Art. III, §§ 21, 23 require that an act must not have changed from its original purpose, have a single subject and that single subject must be clearly expressed in its title. SB43, among others, has more than one subject, fails to conform to the title, fails to keep the public apprised of the general subject matter of the pending law in violation of the Missouri Constitution.
- 81. Mo. Const., Art. I, § 10 requires due process of law before depriving a person of life, liberty or property. Laws lacking in reasonable certainty violate due process and are void for vagueness. SB43 fails to provide sufficient notice to the proscribed conduct to either the actor or enforcer who are subject to the statute and fails to prevent arbitrary or uneven application of the law due to, among others, its confusing and sometimes directly contradictory language.

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 15 of 22 PageID #: 28

82. SB43, among others, has implemented damage caps and eliminated causes of action in violation of the constitution based upon the theories of equal protection and due process.

83. Mo. Const., Art. I, § 14 states: "The courts of justice shall be open to every person, and certain remedy afforded for every injury to person, property or character, and that right and justice shall be administered without sale, denial or delay."

84. SB43 attempts to deny access to injuries and abolish recognized causes of action including but not limited to the exclusivity provisions contained therein and the common law public policy exception.

85. SB43's elimination of state actors as employers is in violation of the Mo. Const. and public policy.

86. The violating provisions of SB43 are essential to the efficacy of SB43 and, therefore, the entire statute should be held unconstitutional.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court strike SB43 in its entirety and alternatively to strike any portion of SB43 to the extent the Court deems it severable; to grant temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief preventing the implementation, enforcement, or application of the unconstitutional laws; for attorney's fees, costs and expenses as may be provided by law, and for such other relief that this Court deems just.

Respectfully submitted,

THE FURNISS LAW FIRM, LLC
/s/ Joshua G. Miller
Pyon M. Furniss (MO #53787)

Ryan M. Furniss (MO #53787) Joshua G. Miller (MO #67496) 222 S. Central Avenue, Suite 1004 Saint Louis, MO 63105 (314) 899-9101 (314) 627-5891 (fax) rfurniss@furnisslaw.com

jmiller@furnisslaw.com

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 16 of 22 PageID #: 29



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

MISSOURI COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

MICHAEL L. PARSON GOVERNOR ANNA S. HUI DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR Martha Staggs COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON ALISA WARREN, PH.D. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Otis Lawson 1549 Lakeside Lane Saint Louis, MO 63138

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE

RE:

Otis Lawson vs. RECKITT BENCKISER E-01/19-50562 28E-2019-00576C

The Missouri Commission on Human Rights (MCHR) is terminating its proceedings and issuing this notice of your right to sue under the Missouri Human Rights Act because you have requested a notice of your right to sue.

This letter indicates your right to bring a civil action within 90 days of the date of this notice against the respondent(s) named in the complaint. Such an action may be brought in any circuit court in any county in which the unlawful discriminatory practice is alleged to have occurred, but it must be brought no later than two years after the alleged cause occurred or its reasonable discovery. Upon issuance of this notice, the MCHR is terminating all proceedings relating to the complaint. No person may file or reinstate a complaint with the MCHR after the issuance of a notice of right to sue relating to the same practice or act. You are hereby notified of your right to sue the Respondent(s) named in your compliant in state circuit court. THIS MUST BE DONE WITHIN 90 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS NOTICE OR YOUR RIGHT TO SUE IS LOST.

You are also notified that the Executive Director is hereby administratively closing this case and terminating all MCHR proceedings relating to it. This notice of right to sue has no effect on the suit-filing period of any federal claims. This notice of right to sue is being issued as required by Section 213.111.1, RSMo, because it has been over 180 days after the filing of the complaint and MCHR has not completed its administrative processing.

over 160 days after the	nling of the complaint a	nd MCHR has not co	ompleted its administrativ	ve processing.
Respectfully,				
Cint				EXHIBIT
Alisa Warren, Ph.D. Executive Director			July 24, 2019 Date	PENGAD 8
C: additional contac	ts listed on next page			
3315 W. TRUMAN BLVD. P.O. BOX 1129 JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102-1129 PHONE: 573-751-3325 Missouri Commission on Huma	111 N. 7TH STREET, SUITE 903 ST. LOUIS, MO 63101-2100 PHONE: 314-340-7590 FAX: 314-340-7238 In Rights is an equal opportunity emp.		1410 GENESSEE, SUITE 280 KANSAS CITY, MO 64102 FAX: 816-889-3582 nd services are available upou request t	106 ARTHUR STREET SUITE D SIKESTON, MO 63801-5454 FAX: 573-472-5321 to individuals with disabilities.

E-Mail: mchr@labor.mo.gov

www.labor.mo.gov/mohumanrights

² Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 17 of 22 PageID #: 30

RE: Otis Lawson vs. RECKITT BENCKISER - E-01/19-50562 28E-2019-00576C

Casey Brown, HR Generalist RB MANUFACTURING LLC 30 Arrowhead Industrial Boulevard Saint Peters, MO 63376

Joshua G. Miller ATTORNEY AT LAW 222 S. Central, Suite 1004 Saint Louis, MO 63105 Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 18 of 22 PageID #: 31 1911-CC00996

EEOC Form 161-B (11/16)

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

N	lo	TICE	OF	RIGHT	TO SUE	(ISSUED	ON	REQUEST	-)

1549	Lawson Lakeside Lane Louis, MO 63138		From:	St. Louis District Office 1222 Spruce Street Room 8.100 Saint Louis, MO 63103	
	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved who CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a))	se Identity Is		,	
EEOC Charg	ge No.	EEOC Representative		Telephone No.	
005 0040		Joseph J. Wilson,			
28E-2019-	00576	State & Local Program N		7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	
NOTICE TO TH	E PERSON AGGRIEVED:	(5	See also t	he additional information enclosed with this form.)	
been issued of your rece	at your request. Your lawsuit under	issued under title VII, the ADA Title VII, the ADA or GINA mu	or GINA	bor the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination based on the above-numbered charge. It has led in a federal or state court WITHIN 90 DAYS led time limit for filing suit based on a claim under	
X	More than 180 days have passed	since the filing of this charge.			
	Less than 180 days have passed able to complete its administration	since the filing of this charge, b ive processing within 180 days	ut I have from the	determined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will filing of this charge.	
X	The EEOC is terminating its proce			g	
	The EEOC will continue to process	s this charge.			
Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA): You may sue under the ADEA at any time from 60 days after the charge was filed un 90 days after you receive notice that we have completed action on the charge. In this regard, the paragraph marked below applies to your case: The EEOC is closing your case. Therefore, your lawsuit under the ADEA must be filed in federal or state court WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this Notice. Otherwise, your right to sue based on the above-numbered charge will be lost.					
	The EEOC is continuing its handlin you may file suit in federal or state	ig of your ADEA case. However court under the ADEA at this t	er, if 60 d	ays have passed since the filing of the charge,	
	ot (EPA): You already have the right tate court within 2 years (3 years for us that occurred more than 2 year	winku vidialionsi ni ina areded i	HIND IIINGG	narge Is not required.) EPA suits must be brought erpayment. This means that backpay due for of be collectible.	
If you file suit,	based on this charge, please send a	copy of your court complaint to	this offic	e.	
Enclosures(s	- (On behalf of the Lloyd J. Vasque District Dire	ez, Jr.,	1	
Co: VJoshua G. Miller ATTORNEY AT LAW 222 S. Central, Suite 1004 Saint Louis, MO 63105 Casey Brown, HR Generalist RB MANUFACTURING LLC 30 Arrowhead Industrial Boulevard Saint Peters, MO 63376 EXHIBIT					

Case: 4:19-cv-03177-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 19 of 297a1e C 100996

IN THE $11^{\rm ST}$ CIRCUIT COURT OF ST. CHARLES COUNTY STATE OF MISSOURI

OTIS LAWSON,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Cause No.:) Division No.:
RECKITT BENCKISER, LLC, a foreign limited liability company,) Division No
SERVE REGISTERED AGENT:) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Co. 221 Bolivar Street)))
Jefferson City, MO 65101)
Defendant.)

REQUEST FOR SUMMONS

Please prepare a summons for the Defendant, Reckitt Benckiser, LLC, CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service, 221 Bolivar Street, Jefferson City, MO 65101.

Respectfully submitted,

THE FURNISS LAW FIRM, LLC

/s/ Joshua G. Miller
Ryan M. Furniss (MO #53787)
Joshua G, Miller (MO #67496)
222 S. Central Ave, Suite 1004
Saint Louis, MO 63105
(314) 914-2522
(314) 627-5891 (fax)
jmiller@furnisslaw.com
rfurniss@furnisslaw.com

Case: 4:19-cv-03 77-RLW Doc. #: 1-5 Filed: 12/02/19 Page: 20 of 22 PageID #: 33



IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

		Case Number: 1911-CC00996 Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address JOSHUA GRAHAM MILLER THE FURNISS LAW FIRM LLC 222 S CENTRAL AVE SUITE 1004
Judge or Division:		Case Number: 1911-CC00996
JON A. CUNNINGHAM		
Plaintiff/Petitioner:		Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address
OTIS LAWSON		JOSHUA GRAHAM MILLER
OTIS EAVISON		THE FURNISS LAW FIRM LLC
		222 S CENTRAL AVE SUITE 1004
	VS.	
Defendant/Respondent:		Court Address:
RECKITT BENCKISER LLC		300 N 2nd STREET FILED SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301
Nature of Suit:	10.444	
CC Employmnt Discrmntn 21		NOV 2.5 2019 (Date File Stamp)
		mmons in Civil Case
The State of Missouri to:		SER LLC
30 ARROWHEAD INDUSTRIAL B	Alias:	CIRCUIT CLERK R 和 G生体 NAGO YEERDIN CORPORATING
SAINT PETERS, MO 63376	LVD	SERVICE CO
		221 BOLIVAR ST
COURT SEAL OF	Vou are summoned	JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101 ed to appear before this court and to file your pleading to the petition, a
OURTOR		attached, and to serve a copy of your pleading upon the attorney for
		at the above address all within 30 days after receiving this summons,
		ay of service. If you fail to file your pleading, judgment by default may
		ou for the relief demanded in the petition.
ST. CHARLES COUNTY	10/22/	2/2019/S/ Cheryl Crowder
SI. CHARLES COUNTY	Date	Clerk
	Further Information:	La 200 and Carrotte Datases
Note to serving officer: Si		heriff's or Server's Return umed to the court within 30 days after the date of issue.
I certify that I have served to		
• • • •		of the petition to the defendant/respondent.
		he petition at the dwelling place or usual abode of the defendant/respondent with
		, a person of the defendant's/respondent's family over the age of
15 years who permane	ntly resides with the def	efendant/respondent.
CSC Language	S. L.	of the summons and a copy of the complaint to: (name) December 2 (title).
other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Served at 350 E.	11: 1: 01	(address)
Served at 330 IZ.	1	
" COL	(County /Cit	ity of St. Louis), MO, on 11-5-19 (date) at 7:30 AL/(time).
Shop & A. A.		By Day your Start 81
Printed Name o	t Sheriff or Server	Signature of Shenif of Server
М	lust be sworn before a no	notary public if not served by an authorized officer:
	ubscribed and sworn to	o before me on (date).
(Seal)	ly commission expires:	,
•	ly commission expires.	Date Notary Public
Sheriff's Fees, if applicable	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	\sim
Summons	\$	
Non Est	\$	
Sheriff's Deputy Salary	¢ 40.00	265
	\$ <u>10.00</u>	
Mileage	D	miles @ \$ per mile)
	s copy of the petition mu	oust be served on each defendant/respondent. For methods of service on all
classes of suits, see Supreme		age be served on each defendant respondent. I of methods of service of all



Request for documentsThurston, Mary K. to: circuit11.closedfiles@courts.mo.gov 10/23/2019 06:26 PM

From: "Thurston, Mary K." < Mary. Thurston@klgates.com>

To: "circuit11.closedfiles@courts.mo.gov" < circuit11.closedfiles@courts.mo.gov>

Hi,

I would like to request from case, 1911-CC00996 - OTIS LAWSON V RECKITT BENCKISER, the Petition and Exhibits filed on 10/18/2019. Please let me know what you need to proceed.

Thank you,

Mary Thurston

K&L GATES

Mary Thurston Legal & Business Research Analyst Library & Research Services **K&L Gates** Direct Dial Number: 206-370-6807 Email: mary.thurston@klgates.com

This electronic message contains information from the law firm of K&L Gates LLP. The contents may be privileged and confidential and are intended for the use of the intended addressee(s) only. If you are not an intended addressee, note that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact me at Mary.Thurston@klgates.com.-5

OCT 2 4 2019

CIRCUIT CLERK ST. CHARLES CO





IN THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. CHARLES COUNTY, MISSOURI

Judge or Division:		Case Number: 1911-CC00996	
JON A. CUNNINGHAM			
Plaintiff/Petitioner:		Plaintiff's/Petitioner's Attorney/Address	
OTIS LAWSON		JOSHUA GRAHAM MILLER	
		THE FURNISS LAW FIRM LLC	
		222 S CENTRAL AVE SUITE 1004	
	VS.	SAINT LOUIS, MO 63105 Court Address:	
Defendant/Respondent: RECKITT BENCKISER LL	C	300 N 2nd STREET	
Nature of Suit:	.0	SAINT CHARLES, MO 63301	
CC Employmnt Discrmntn	213.111		(Date File Stamp)
		mmons in Civil Case	
The State of Missouri to	: RECKITT BENCKIS	SER LLC	
	Alias:	DIA CCC LAWY	ERS INCORPORATING
30 ARROWHEAD INDUSTRIAL SAINT PETERS, MO 63376	BLVD	SERVICE CO	ERS INCORPORATING
GARTTETERS, ING. COO.		221 BOLIVAR S	
COURT SEAL OF	Vou are summone	JEFFERSON CI d to appear before this court and to file your	
OURION	copy of which is a	ttached, and to serve a copy of your pleading	g upon the attorney for
	plaintiff/petitioner	at the above address all within 30 days after	receiving this summons,
(3)(323)(8)	exclusive of the da	ay of service. If you fail to file your pleading,	judgment by default may
3	be taken against y	ou for the relief demanded in the petition.	
1	10/22	/2019/S/ Cr	neryl Crowder
ST. CHARLES COUNTY	Date	Clerk	
	Further Information:		
		neriff's or Server's Return	
		rned to the court within 30 days after the date of issu	e.
I certify that I have served		f the petition to the defendant/respondent.	
leaving a copy of the	e summons and a copy of summons and a copy of th	ne netition at the dwelling place or usual abode of the	defendant/respondent with
-		a person of the defendant's/respond	dent's family over the age of
15 years who perma	nently resides with the de	fendant/respondent.	
	ration) delivering a copy	of the summons and a copy of the complaint to: (name)	(title).
Served at			(address)
			ate) at (time).
in	(County/Ci	(4)	(
Printed Name	e of Sheriff or Server Must be sworn before a n	Signature of Solution of Sol	Sheriff or Server
		before me on	(date).
(Seal)			
	My commission expires:	Date No.	otary Public
Sheriff's Fees, if applicab	lo		
Summons	s:		
Non Est	\$		
Sheriff's Deputy Salary			
Supplemental Surcharge	\$10.00		
Mileage	\$(_	miles @ \$ per mile)	
Total	\$	the second on an I defendant/or an and ant for an	othode of service on all
A copy of the summons an classes of suits, see Supre	d a copy of the petition m me Court Rule 54.	ust be served on each defendant/respondent. For m	ethous of service off all